Item No. 5 Information on Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995.

In the 220th meeting of Central Board held on 21.02.2018, the issue of pension on higher wages and other issues related to Pension Scheme were discussed. It was decided that these issues will be discussed in the next meeting of the Central Board. Accordingly, information on Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 is furnished.

1. Vide GSR 748(E) dated 16.11.1995 published in the Gazette of India Extra, Pt.II, Sec. 3(i), dated 16th November, 1995 the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 was notified for implementation, substituting the erstwhile Employees Family Pension Scheme, 1971.
2. The option to become the member of this Scheme was given w.e.f. 01.04.1993 itself to the members who left membership or died between 01.04.1993 and 15.11.1995.
3. In the Employees' Pension Scheme, provision was made for diversion of 8.33% of wage out of the Employer share of P.F. contribution along with the contribution of 1.16% of wage from Government to the EPS account. The balance amount is required to be continued in the account of the P.F. member as employer share of contribution.
4. Different stakeholders including the employees of big establishments, Public Sector undertakings, various Trade Unions and Political Parties opposed this Scheme. Many Establishments, Employees Associations and others approached various High Courts against implementation of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995.
5. Several rounds of negotiations were initiated by the Government for acceptance of Employees' Pension Scheme by the opposing parties. In order to have wider acceptance by various shareholders, following provisions were added in the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 on 28th February 1996 as major amendments within three months of introduction of the main scheme:-

(i) Option for Commutation
(ii)Option for Return of Capital
(iii) Option to contribute on higher wages exceeding the statutory limit.

These were perhaps introduced to make EPS, 1995 more attractive to a wider group of employees without detailed financial analysis regarding sustainability of the Pension Fund on long term basis.

6. CONTRIBUTION TO PROVIDENT FUND ON HIGHER WAGE

The provision for contribution on higher wages is provided in Para 26(6) of Employees Provident Fund Scheme 1952, which reads as following.

Para 26(6)

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this paragraph an officer not below rank of an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner may, on the joint request in writing, of any employee of a factory or the establishment to which this Scheme applies and his employer, enroll such employee as a member or allow him to contribute on more than (rupees six thousand and five hundred) of his pay per month if he is already a member of the Fund and thereupon such employee shall be entitled to the benefits and shall be subject to the conditions of the Fund, provided that the employer gives an undertaking in writing that he shall pay the administrative charges payable and shall comply with all statutory provisions in respect of such employee."

7. **CONTRIBUTION TO PENSION FUND ON HIGHER WAGE**

The erstwhile Para 11(3) (deleted through amendment dated 22.08.2014) of Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 provided the clause for considering higher wage as pensionable salary under Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 and is reproduced below:-

"The maximum pensionable salary shall be limited to [Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs. 6500/-] per month.

Provided that if at the option of the employers and employee, contribution paid on salary exceeding [Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs. 6500/-] per month from the date of commencement of this Scheme or from the date salary exceeds [Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs. 6500/-] whichever is later, and 8.33 percent Share of the employers thereof is remitted into the Pension Fund; pensionable salary shall be based on such higher salary."

This provision for contributing on higher wages in Pension Fund continued from 16.11.1995 to 31.08.2014 in the EPS, 1995 as a legal provision. As such provision under this para 11(3)of EPS, 1995 allowed employer and employee to pay contribution to Pension Fund on higher wage and get the pension on such higher wage on retirement or otherwise, upto 31.08.2014.

8. After introduction of new benevolent provisions the Bill on Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 was passed by the Parliament also.

9. In the meantime, various petitions against introduction of Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 were filed in different High Courts and all cases were transferred to Hon'ble Supreme Court through Transfer Petition. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the year 2003 decided the pending matters by upholding the validity of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995.

10. Since the matter was pending in Hon'ble Supreme Court up to 2003 and some interim orders were also passed during this period, many of the Employees who had not opted to become members of Pension Scheme were given opportunity to become members of the Pension Scheme and also to contribute on higher wages as per the provisions of Para 11(3) of Employees Pension Scheme, 1995 through detailed instructions dated 05.02.2004 for payment of contribution.

11. Subsequently, considering the financial viability of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 based on various actuarial reports till then, the opportunity for giving option to contribute on higher wages on becoming member of the Employees' Pension Scheme was stopped in the year 2004 vide circular No.Pen 4(38)/96/WB/59867 dated 01.12.2004. A clarificatory circular discontinuing acceptance of contributions on higher wage in Pension Fund was also issued vide communication dated 22.11.2006.

12. Although administrative instructions were issued disallowing option to contribute on higher wages (wages exceeding ceiling amount), this provision for contribution on higher wage in scheme was not amended till the year 2014. So legally, the provision for contribution on higher wages continued from 16.11.1995 to 31.08.2014.

13. The provisions relating to option for commutation and option for return of capital were deleted with effect from 26.09.2008 by GSR.688(E) dated 26.09.2008.

14. The scheme was amended in 2014 by omitting the proviso to clause 11 (3) by G.S.R. No.609 (E), dated 22.08.2014 (with effect from 01.09.2014).

15. During the period 2004 to 2014 many cases were filed in various forums and High Courts, praying for payment of pension on higher wages by allowing to contribute on higher wages under the pension scheme.

16. On being aggrieved by the orders of the High Courts, EPFO appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court wherein the department filed 8 SLPs in series against the orders of Hon'ble Kerala High Court. The said SLPs were dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 31.03.2016 (7 – SLPs) and dated 12.07.2016 (1-SLP) by bunching the SLPs. Some of the Writ Petitions filed against the stand taken by EPFO in this matter were as old as 2007, that is, immediately after issue of circulars for stoppage of option for contribution on higher wages.

The details are as under:-

Details of SLP dismissed by Supreme Court of India

S.No.		SLP No.	Title	Arising out of order	Against W.P No.	Name of the establishment	Whether Exempted or Unexempted
1.	i)	7074/2014	A.Majeed Kunju & Ors.	**1135/2012**– dt.05.03.13	**7878/2011** dt.24.02.12	Kerala State Handloom Development Corpn. Ltd.	Unexempted
	ii)	7075/2014	Abdul Hakkim Sherief & Ors	**1137/2012–** dt.05.03.13	**15252/2011** dt.24.02.12	Kerala State Handloom Development Corpn. Ltd.	Unexempted
	iii)	7076/2014	M.Babu & Ors	**568/2012–** dt.05.03.13	**6643/2007** dt.04.11.11	**Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd.**	**Exempted**
	iv)	7107/2014	A.K.Jayappan & Ors.	**569/2012–** dt.05.03.13	**9929/2007** dt.04.11.11	**Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd.**	**Exempted (Relaxed)**
	v)	7108/2014	P.N.Pillai & Ors.	**1174/2012–** dt.05.03.13	**13220/2007** dt.12.04.12	Hindustan Newsprint Ltd.	**Exempted**
	vi)	7224/2014	S.Nizar & Ors.	**1138/2012**	**15313/2011**	Kerala State Handloom Development Corpn. Ltd.	Unexempted
	vii)	697/2016	K.J.Varkey & Ors.	**1423/2014**	**167/2014** dt.04.03.14	Kerala State Handloom Development Corpn. Ltd.	Unexempted
	(Dismissed vide common order dated 31.03.2016)						
2.		19954/2015	Austin Joseph & Ors.	**1362/2014** dt. 17.10.14	**254/2014** dt.04.03.14	Kerala State Financial Enterprises Ltd.	Unexempted

(Dismissed vide order dt.12.07.16)

17. Out of the 8 SLPs dismissed, three were relating to employees of Exempted establishments, namely, FACT (2 SLPs) and Hindustan Newsprint Limited (1 SLP).

18. The remaining SLPs were relating to employees of Unexempted establishments, namely, Kerala State Handloom Development Corporation Limited (4 SLPs) and Kerala State Financial Enterprises Limited (one SLP).

19. After dismissal of the aforesaid multiple SLPs by the Apex Court, compliance of the orders in the respective Writ Petitions was required to be made and benefit of pension on higher wages retrospectively was allowed to the members who were petitioners in the aforesaid writ petitions including the employees of the concerned exempted establishments.

20. In the case of employees of FACT Limited, the request of the employees to remit the pension contribution on higher wages was permitted earlier by EPFO and the difference amount was transferred and credited to the Pension Account. Later on, the permission already granted was disallowed and the differential amount was transferred back to the P.F. account in the Exempted Trust on the plea that the difference amount was deposited after the cut-off date of 01.12.2004 based on the circular issued by EPFO on the subject matter.

21. In the case of Hindustan Newsprint Limited, the Petitioners had given option on 20.01.1999 for contributing to EPS, 1995 on actual salary from 16.11.1995. But the employer remitted the contribution on full wages from April, 2003 onwards awaiting further direction. Hence the order of the Hon'ble High Court allowing the benefit of retrospective contribution under Para 11(3) of the Pension Scheme was on the basis of the factual circumstances of the case and it cannot be construed that the benefit of retrospective option under Clause 11(3) can be allowed to employees of all exempted establishments in general.

22. Thus the judgement passed by the Hon'ble High Court on the facts of the cases of FACT Ltd. & Hindustan News Print Ltd. cannot be construed to be applicable in general to employees of all exempted establishments.

23. After disposal of the SLPs, various Writs were filed and orders allowing option to contribute on Higher wages retrospectively were issued. Two SLPs were filed by employees of M/s Himachal Pradesh Tourism Development Corporation against the orders of the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh disallowing the option for contributing to Pension Fund on higher wage. The Hon'ble Supreme Court disposed off the aforesaid 2 SLPs vide order dated 04.10.2016 (R.C. Gupta Vs RPFC Shimla) allowing the petitions.

24. In this matter of R.C. Gupta Vs. RPFC Shimla the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its judgment dated 04.10.2016, decided the matter of pensionary benefit on higher wages with detailed order examining the provisions of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 and Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 and also citing the orders passed by the Apex Court for dismissal of SLPs filed by EPFO with reference to the orders passed by Hon'ble Kerala High Court.

25. Relevant portion of judgment of the Supreme Court dated 04.10.2016 may be summarized and reproduced as follows:-

    (a) Reading the proviso, we find that the reference to the date of commencement of the Scheme or the date on which the salary exceeds the ceiling limit are dates from which the option exercised are to be reckoned with for calculation of pensionable salary. The said dates are not cut-off dates to determine the eligibility of the employer-employee to indicate their option under the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the pension Scheme.

(b) A somewhat similar view that has been taken by this court in a matter coming from the Kerala High Court, wherein the special Leave petition (C) No. 7074 of 2014 filed by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner was rejected by this court by order dated 31.03.2016.

(c) A beneficial Scheme, in our considered view, ought not to be allowed to be defeated by reference to a cut-off date, particularly, in a situation where (as in the present case) the employer had deposited 12% of the actual salary and not 12% of the ceiling limit of Rs. 5,000/- or Rs. 6,500/- per month, as the case may be.

(d) Exercise of the option under paragraph 26(6) is a necessary precursor to the exercise of option under Clause 11(3). Exercise of such option, therefore, would not foreclose the exercise of a further option under Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme unless the circumstances warranting such foreclosure are clearly indicated.

(e) The above apart, in a situation where the deposit of the employer's share at 12% has been on the actual salary and not the ceiling amount, we do not see how the Provident Fund Commissioner could have been aggrieved to file the LPA before the Division Bench of the High Court.

(f) All that the Provident Fund Commissioner is required to do in the case is an adjustment of accounts which in turn would have benefitted some of the employees. At best what the Provident Fund Commissioner could do and which we permit him to do under the present order, is to seek a return of all such amounts that the concerned employees may have taken or withdrawn from their Provident Fund Account before granting them the benefit of the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. Once such a return is made in whichever cases such return is due, consequential benefits in terms of this order will be granted to the said employees.

26. The outcome and implications of orders of the SLPs already dismissed and detailed order dated 04.10.2016 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was placed for consideration and opinion before senior officers of Head Office in the meeting held on 23.11.2016 wherein it was decided to place the matter before Pension and EDLI Implementation Committee (PEIC) for taking decision on compliance of orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court considering the financial implication involved in compliance of the judgment.

27. The matter was placed before Pension and EDLI Implementation Committee (PEIC) in its meeting dated 08.12.2016. After detailed discussion, Pension and EDLI Implementation Committee (PEIC) agreed to comply with the aforesaid order and recommended to place it before Central Board of Trustees (CBT).

(i) – **Unexempted establishment** - However, it was agreed that compliance may be made immediately in respect of the Provident Fund & Pension Members including superannuated cases whose accounts are maintained by EPFO as their details are already available with EPFO and contribution on higher wages has been received by EPFO. Their pension settlement may be regulated in accordance with the order of the Hon'ble

Supreme Court by taking joint option from the employee and the employer and transfer/payment to Pension Fund as per details of payable contributions with interest.

(ii) – **Exempted establishment** - In respect of those members of Exempted Provident Fund Trusts whose contribution on higher wages has not been received by EPFO, it was decided that their cases may be examined on verification of books of record of the exempted establishment and the trust regarding compliance to Provident Fund and Pension Fund as per the provisions of the EPF Scheme 1952 and Employees' Pension Scheme 1995 and the information may be submitted to the committee.

28. The matter was placed as a separate agenda in the 215th CBT meeting on 19.12.2016. The Central Board of Trustees (CBT) approved the proposal contained in the agenda as per recommendations of PEIC for consideration of the Government for implementation.

29. The proposal for implementing the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 04.10.2016 by way of issuing administrative instructions to field offices for compliance as approved by Central Board of Trustees (CBT) was forwarded to Ministry of Labour & Employment vide UO. Note Pension-I/12/33/EPS Amendement/96/Vol.II 1839 dated 10.01.2017.

30. After series of queries and discussions by the MOL&E on the subject matter, the MOL&E vide letter dated 16.03.2017 conveyed its approval to implement the directions given in the order dated 04.10.2016 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as per proposal approved and recommended by the CBT, EPF.

31. Accordingly the officers in-charge of all filed offices were directed vide letter No.Pension-I/12/33/EPS Amendment/96/Vol.II/34007 dated 23.03.2017 to take necessary action in accordance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.33032-33033 of 2015 as approved by the Government and as per the provisions of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 and Schemes framed there under.

32. Upon issue of instructions for compliance of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court as above, many groups of employees belonging to Exempted Establishments who had not contributed on higher wages to the Pension Fund started approaching the various field offices of EPFO for extending the benefits to them also.

33. The case of exempted establishments was examined in detail further with regard to the Supreme Court judgments, as per decision of the Pension and EDLI Implementation Committee. It was found that the Supreme Court order is not applicable to the exempted establishments and benefits cannot be given to these employees for the reasons annexed.

34. Considering the difficulties faced by the field offices in convincing such employees belonging to exempted establishments that they are not covered by the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 04.10.2016 for Pension on higher wages in compliance of the instant judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, clarification was issued on 31.05.2017 that the provisions mentioned by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated 04.10.2016 applied only to the employees of unexempted establishments, whose both Provident Fund and

Pension contributions were being deposited by the employer in EPFO account. As such the decision of the Pension & EDLI Implementation Committee has been complied with.

35. After issue of such clarification many of the groups of employees belonging to exempted establishments filed petitions in various High Courts challenging the clarification issued on 31.05.2017 and claiming for benefits misrepresenting the instant judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

36. In order to avoid adverse order from different courts, a conscious decision was taken to file a petition for transfer of all such petitions filed in various High Courts to the Hon'ble Supreme Court to have uniform and finality in the matter. Accordingly, a petition for transfer of petitions have already been filed in Hon'ble Supreme Court.

37. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has passed an interim order dated 15.12.2017 in the said transfer petition wherein it has requested the other High Courts to await for the outcome of the order passed by the High Court of Kerala in the cases reserved for judgment and only thereafter to proceed further in the matter and that too subject to further orders to be passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in these matters.

38. The provisions of the Employees' Pension Fund 1995 has been subject to litigation from its inception in different courts starting from District Consumer Forums due to various factors including the complexities in the Scheme and interpretation of the Court, added with the view taken by legal fora on humanitarian ground and considering Pension Scheme as welfare measure of the Government. Even after the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2003, upholding the validity of Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995, the cases filed by the members right from consumer forums to High Courts have been enormous. As per information made available by the field offices more than 400 cases relating to EPS 1995 are pending in various courts.

39. The Consumer Forums & Courts have been issuing orders on humanitarian grounds considering the pension scheme as a welfare legislation. Such orders are either based on the interpretation of the provisions under the scheme, absence of express provisions in the scheme and at times not in consonance with the Scheme provisions.

40. The cases and disputes relating to EPS crop up due to the fact that pension granted is not directly linked to the contributions paid by the individual member of this scheme during entire period of membership. Rather it is based on the average pay at the end of the membership which is much higher than the average of entire period of membership. Infact, the contribution against a member are not even individually accounted. It is credited to a pool find. Since benefits of the pension is granted for entire life time of the pensioners from a pool fund contributed by all members for future payouts it is thought by the pensioners that common fund can pay higher pension irrespective of their individual accumulated contribution.

41. It is believed that the spate of litigation can be stopped only by a complete revamp of the pension scheme and moving towards a individual contribution based scheme from the current pool based scheme.

Reasons for not extending the benefits envisaged in the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 04.10.2016 to the employees of the exempted establishments cannot be considered on following grounds.

i) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 04.10.2016 has clearly mentioned that option under para 26(6) of the Employees' Pension Scheme 1952 is a necessary precursor to the exercise of option under clause 11 (3) of the Employees' Pension Scheme 1995.

The provisions of the para 26(6) of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme 1952 applies to the employees of unexempted establishments only for whom deposit of Provident Fund contribution is made in account maintained by EPFO. The employees of Exempted Establishments are governed by the respective Provident Fund Schemes of concerned establishments as framed by the Establishment and managed by the respective board of Trustees. <u>As such the judgement is not applicable to them.</u>

ii) Monthly contributions to Provident Fund have not been paid to EPFO by these employees whereas the demand is for benefits from EPFO. They are demanding to pay monthly contributions to Pension Fund on higher wage for past many years now. It is much relevant to impress that EPFO has not accepted monthly contribution from the employees of even unexempted establishments now who had not given joint option from the date of eligibility and paid for contribution on actual salary under Para 26 (6) of the EPF Scheme, 1952. What has been granted is only a reclassification of contributions already paid to EPFO so far based on Court order.

iii) If monthly contributions are accepted by EPFO now, the same demand will be made by unexempted establishments' employees also, who have not made such contributions, which will be in effect extending the facility to contribute on higher wages to any and all members of EPF with retrospective effect.

iv) Allowing benefit of retrospective option to members of Pension Scheme of exempted establishments whose contribution was received in the pension fund on higher wage would bring them at par with those member/pensioners who had the foresight to contribute to the Pension Fund on higher wages since beginning and who had accordingly sacrificed a part of their earnings (by not depositing the contribution above the ceiling amount in P.F and earn handsome interest on it) to avail higher pension, continuously for several years.

If the option to contribute retrospectively is allowed to those who consciously chose not to make contribution in Pension Fund on salary above ceiling limit, they will get the same benefit now (that is pension on higher wages) and this will send a wrong message.

v) If these employees of exempted establishments could have complied in the initial days of beginning of Employees Pension scheme 1995, the return on investment could have been on much higher rate of return and for longer period as the rate of interest in late 1990's and early 2000's were around 12 to 14 % where s the current interest rate on investment is around 6%. Further, it would have yielded returns for future period also as EPFO investments are for longer tenure. As such deposit of the amount for past many years (having higher return regime) in the current low interest regime and paying pension on much higher wage for future (say 15 to 20 years) will be detrimental to the financial health of the pension fund. It is not just loss of past interest income, but erosion of corpus itself.

vi) It is stated that if a member is allowed to give option to contribute on higher wages in the Pension Scheme, retrospectively, it will amount to enhancing monthly pension of the member many fold without getting any contribution from him towards increased pension. This will be evident from the following live example where the member retired on 31.03.2011 and subsequently remitted contribution on higher wages in 2016.

PPO No:	:	XXXXXXXXX
PF Account No.	:	XXXXXXXXX
Date of Birth	:	01.04.1953
Date of Joining	:	01.04.1983
Date of Exit	:	31.03.2011
NCP days	:	0
Date of Commencement of Pension	:	01.04.2011
Past Service	:	13years 5months 18days
Pensionable service	:	15years 4months 16days
Weightage	:	2
Commutation option	:	N
ROC option	:	N

Calculation of Pension

	Existing	Revised (on higher wages)
Pensionable salary	6500	78106
Pension as per formula	1613*	19384
Past service benefit	313	313
Total pension	1926	19697

*including weightage

Amount remitted (contribution at 8.33% on higher wages with Interest up to 10/2016):	Rs.7,64,971/-
Arrears of Pension paid:	Rs.12,21,076/-

Thus in this case the member received an amount of Rs. 456105 up front as arrears of pension and his monthly pension was increased 10 times from Rs. 1926 to Rs. 19697, without practically paying single Rupee towards the enhanced pension in the Pension Scheme. The liability of this enhanced monthly pension will be borne by the members who are presently contributing to the Pension Scheme.

vii) That after the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in the aforesaid matter, as per the data received, pension has been revised in respect of 1175 pensioners' upto 30.06.2017. The details are as under:

Sl. No	Name of Regional Office	Total No. Pensioners	Amount of contribution and interest remitted by pensioners (In Rs.)	Old Pension (In Rs.)	New Pension (In Rs.)	Pension Arrears paid to pensioners (In Rs.)
1	RO, Kannur	81	20553462	149898	648197	25213944
2	RO, Kochi	489	158010947	866315	4001877	169894870
3	RO, Kollam	58	31234177	101692	682608	36680128
4	RO, Kottayam	59	21953239	105572	503649	23922839
5	RO, Kozhikode	297	68215669	524466	2130410	84749984
6	RO, Trivandrum	191	86230650	380919	2173730	90082275
	TOTAL	**1175**	**386198144**	**2128862**	**10140471**	**430544040**

viii) It would be evident that in nearly every case the pension arrears paid to the pensioners is much more than the amount of contribution and interest remitted by the pensioners.

ix) It can be seen from the table/data that the average original pension in respect of 1175 pensioners is Rs.1811.80 and the average revised pension in respect of 1175 pensioners is Rs.8630.19. Thus the increase in average pension is Rs.6818.39 for each revised case.

x) It is reported that as on 31.03.2016 there are 53.85 lakh pensioners out of which 9,72,231 member pensioners are of exempted establishments. If all the employees of exempted establishments who have contributed on higher salary to the P.F. Trust of Exempted Establishments give option for revision of pension, the monthly impact will be 662.9 crore per month. Such huge outgo would make the fund unsustainable.

xi) In order to provide proper social security cover, the Govt. enhanced minimum pension to Rs.1,000/- w.e.f. 01.09.2014. The yearly expenditure to provide the minimum pension Rs.1,000/- is as under:-

S. No.	Year	No. Pensioner affected	Amount provided by Central Government (Rs.)

	2014-15	18,55,273	439.46 Cr.
	2015-16	18,34,791	821.70 Cr.
	2016-17	18,34,624	813.05 Cr.

This additional liability of approximately Rs. 800.00 crore is provided entirely by the Central Govt. through budgetary support as pension fund cannot bear this load.

xii) Vide letter dated 17.01.2017 EPFO had sought comments of actuary with respect to the financial implication of the fund if members drawing salary exceeding Rs.15,000/- per month are allowed to become the members of the Pension Scheme. The actuary informed that allowing member to contribute on salary without ceiling and get benefit on the same will not be financially viable.

Proposal: **The above information is pl aced before the Board.**